



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/594,777

10/04/2007

Matthew Trevor Snowden

Acergy-57

7103

39703

7590

09/23/2011

C. JAMES BUSHMAN  
5851 San Felipe  
SUITE 975  
HOUSTON, TX 77057

EXAMINER

ANDRISH, SEAN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3672

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/23/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/594,777	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SNOWDON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SEAN ANDRISH	<b>Art Unit</b> 3672	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SEAN ANDRISH. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Paul Grandinetti. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 9/16/11; 9/19/11.

Type:    ☒ Telephonic    ☐ Video Conference  
           ☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant    ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:    ☐ Yes    ☒ No.  
     If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Issues Discussed    ☐101    ☒112    ☐102    ☐103    ☐Others  
 (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1 - 13 and 15 - 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: Recalde (4,721,411).

**Substance of Interview**  
 (For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Examiner called applicant to discuss 112(2) antecedent basis errors and editorial changes in the claims. Examiner stated that he thought the case was in condition for allowance pending an allowance conference with primary examiners. Examiner contacted the applicant following the allowance conference to explain that the case was not in condition for allowance because the apparatus as disclosed by Recalde teaches all of the claim limitations. Although Recalde only teaches a rigid pipe, the apparatus of Recalde is capable of receiving flexible pipe and diverting it to a more vertical orientation for departure from a vesse when the apparatus is substantially horizontal.

**Applicant recordation instructions:** It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

**Examiner recordation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

	/Sean Andrish/ 9/20/2011
--	-----------------------------